

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Identifying the esrog

The Gemara begins by citing a Baraisa that examines the identity of the פרי עץ הדר.

The opinion of Rabanan that it is an esrog is explained, based on translating the word הדר as "beautiful."

Two more opinions from the Baraisa are cited.

2) Clarifying the Mishnah

The reason an esrog from an idolatrous city is invalid is explained.

Two reasons are presented for the disqualification of an esrog of orlah.

The dispute is limited, and the Gemara presents a case where there is a practical difference between the two reasons.

The opinion of R' Assi is identified as the strict opinion.

3) The disputes between R' Meir and Chachamim

R' Assi cites three cases (esrog, matzah and challah) where R' Meir and Chachamim dispute whether maaser sheni may be used for the mitzvah.

Rabbah bar Shmuel explains how we know that one must own his matzah.

The Gemara unsuccessfully attempts to draw support for R' Assi from a Baraisa.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The reason an esrog that is תרומה טמאה is invalid is explained.

R' Ami and R' Assi dispute why an esrog that is תרומה טהורה should not be used. The reason is also given why, if it was used, it is acceptable.

The dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel is explained.

The Gemara explains why demai should not be taken, but why, if it was, it is valid.

5) חזוית

R' Chisda qualifies the Mishnah's ruling concerning a חזוית.

Rava further qualifies the disqualification of חזוית.

The disqualification of a removed pitam is explained.

6) A peeled esrog

Rava rules that a peeled esrog is valid as long as it is red.

This ruling is unsuccessfully challenged from our Mishnah. ■

Distinctive INSIGHT

An esrog owned by partners

מתקיף לה רב פפא בשלמא עיסה דכתיב ראשית עריסותיכם אתרוג נמי דכתיב לכם משלכם, אלא מצה מי כתיב מצתכם

Rav Assi points out three halachos which apply only if the mitzvah item is owned by a Jew and not by a gentile. These are the esrog for Sukkos, matzah for Pesach, and dough from which a portion will be separated and given to a kohen for חלה. In fact, in each of these cases, Rabbi Meir holds that the respective mitzvah cannot be fulfilled with a specimen of מעשר שני. If the esrog or matzah is from מעשר שני, it is considered to be ממון גבוה—a financial asset which is consecrated, and it therefore does not qualify as "personal property." Similarly, dough of מעשר שני is exempt from the halacha of giving חלה.

Ritva notices a peculiar contrast. On the one hand, the Torah requires both an esrog and dough to be owned by a Jew, each based upon a verse which states that the mitzvah must be "לכם." Yet an esrog must be exclusively owned by the one Jew who wishes to use it for the mitzvah, and the esrog is not valid even if it is owned jointly by two or more Jews. This is considered an unacceptable situation for לכם. This is not the case by dough for the mitzvah of חלה. Here, dough that is owned by several Jews is obligated in the mitzvah, even if there is not enough dough owned by each partner for the mitzvah to be done. Why is this?

Ritva answers that לכם generally indicates exclusivity, as we find by esrog. However, in reference to the mitzvah of חלה the Torah writes עריסותיכם, which is plural, thus indicating that even dough of partners is obligated in the mitzvah. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How do the words פרי עץ הדר indicate that the mitzvah is to take an esrog?

2. What are the two reasons an esrog of orlah is invalid?

3. What are the two reasons one should, preferably, not take an esrog of terumah that is tahor?

4. Under what conditions will a חזוית invalidate an esrog?

HALACHAH Highlight

The Pitam

נטלה פטמתו

If the pitam was removed, [the esrog is pasul.]

The following is a concise summary of the laws related to the pitam. There are, for halachic purposes, three parts of the “pitam.” The ball at the very top of the stem is called the shoshanta. The wooden stem beneath the shoshanta is the pitam and, as will be explained below, there is a difference between the part of the pitam that is above the body of the esrog and the part that penetrates into the body of the esrog.

1) If the entire pitam was removed, leaving a hole in the fruit, the esrog is invalid.¹

2) There is a dispute between Rabbeinu Chananel and Rabbeinu Tam regarding an esrog whose pitam was removed leaving the remaining portion of the pitam flush with the body of the esrog.¹

3) If only part of the pitam was removed and the part that remains extends higher than the surface of the

esrog, it is valid.¹

4) If only the shoshanta was removed the esrog is valid. If a comparable quality esrog with a shoshanta is available, it should be used but if not, the one without the shoshanta is valid.²

Poskim disagree³ whether an esrog disqualified because it does not meet standards of beauty (הדר) is invalid only the first day or is invalid for all the days of Sukkos. In the event that there is a dispute whether a disqualification is because it is lacking beauty (הדר) or whether it is deficient (חסר), which is valid for use after the first day, we are lenient and allow such an esrog to be used if another is not available.⁴ Therefore, since there is a dispute whether the disqualification of the pitam removed is because it is lacking standards of beauty or because it is deficient one can be lenient after the first day and take the esrog, without making a bracha, if another is not available.⁵ ■

1. שלחן ערוך סי' תרמ"ח סע' ז' ומשנה ברורה שם סק"ל
2. רמ"א שם וע' לשון השלה"ק המובא בבאר הגולה
3. דעת השלחן ערוך סי' תרמ"ט סע' ה' להקל דפסול הדר אינו אלא ביום א' ודעת הרמ"א שם להחמיר ולפסול הדר כל ז' משום הידור מצוה
4. ע' משנה ברורה סי' תרמ"ט ס"ק ל"ו בשם האליה רבא דאם א"א למצוא אחר יש לסמוך על המקילין כיון דרוב פוסקים ס"ל דהפסולין משום הדר כשר בשאר יומי
5. מ"ב שם ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Mesirus nefesh to acquire an esrog

נטלה פטמתו...פסול

Rav Michel of Zlotchov, ז"ל, owned a beautiful pair of tefillin that had been handed down to him by his father, Rav Yitzchak, the Maggid of Terhovitz, ז"ל. Despite his crushing poverty, Rav Michel refused to part with the tefillin even though wealthy Chassidim offered huge sums for them and he had another pair for regular use. Rav Michel's rebbetzin con-

stantly adjured him to sell them to provide for their family, but Rav Michel would not be swayed.

One erev Sukkos arrived and no esrogim were to be found in all of Zlotchov. People tried to import esrogim from other towns but failed. Eventually, one man managed to bring a mehudar esrog to sell in Zlotchov and offered it at an astronomical price. Rav Michel decided to sell his prized tefillin, and bought the esrog himself.

At first, he tried to hide his actions from his family, but eventually they pried the truth out of him.

“Could it be?! How many times have we begged you to sell those

tefillin to support us and you refused—and now you sold it for an esrog?!” Without thinking, someone grabbed the valuable esrog off the table, bit off the pitom, and hurled it to the ground in frustration, making it invalid.

Rav Michel raised his eyes heavenward. “Ribbono shel Olam, I've lost my tefillin, I've lost my esrog, should I lose my temper too?” He restrained himself and didn't react at all.

Some time later, his father spoke to him in a dream. “Your self-restraint made more of an impact on high than the self-sacrifice it took to trade away the tefillin!” ■

